

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of October 16, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, October 16, 2012.

Present: Ed Horne, John Taylor, Hal Hester, Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Bernice Cutler, Travis Haston, Kevin Silva, Harry Sherrill, Tim West and Rob Belisle

Absent: Jon Wood and Zeke Acosta

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The motion by Ed Horne, seconded by Bernice Cutler, to approve the September 18, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Bernice Cutler: Two issues from the Apartment Association; 1) grounding and connecting power sources in a multi-family building. We've determined that is in code and there is no question about that but the issue that it raised is when we come across issues that are a part of Code that either haven't been noticed or haven't been installed that way, or inspected that way, when we notice issues and they come to the forefront and they need to be changed, do we have a line in the sand, or a policy to say when this stuff comes up here is how it is going to be applied across the board and if we don't can we? What raised this issue is when multiple power; when you are bringing power to a building in multiple locations like you do on a typical multi-family building, there is a piece in the code that requires you to connect them in grounding and what they are doing is basically connecting them in copper between all those power sources and there's no question that is part of the code. It hadn't been done up until recently or inspected that way. One of those issues where it's a part of Code and nobody's questioning that but had never come up before and we have those things from time to time. My question as a general rule, not specific to that situation because it's over but as a general rule, do we have a policy for when issues like this come up do we have a line in the sand because it's an economic impact if you've got a sub that is already underway on a job and got a price on it and everybody's backing up to include something they weren't anticipating including the fact that it was in Code and they should have been but nobody's noticed it all along including the department and the professionals.

GMullis: Basically when we have those things get with Jeff or myself depending on where you are in the field, if you've gotten through to the field inspector and it's not in agreement there then you bring it in to the manager and we'll determine if there is a formal policy but there is not one here because it is a specific instance that you are referring to. I wouldn't say there is a formal policy for it but the policy once it hits the field is to contact the manager whether it's North or South and then we get with the CAs to resolve the issue.

BC: What I am looking for in response to the Apartment Association's question is when issues come up that everyone is in agreement on, it's not a clarification issue, yes it's in code, we never noticed it before, we haven't been doing it this way, inspectors haven't been asking for it; where do we grandfather it, where do we back date it where do we have a line or policy on which we are going to implement it.

GM: I have to give this answer on a case by case basis; it depends on what it is. If it's a dangerous situation and it's something we all should have been noticing and no one has noticed it; it may be that you just have to make the correction if it's a safety issue. If it's a grey issue and we just haven't been enforcing it that way as Gary indicated, more times than not is the case of some inspectors were diligent in enforcing a part of but there may have been a project or the last couple of projects that you've been involved with, it appears the department has never enforced that and it seems like a new item but it may not necessarily be from a department standpoint it may not be something that we haven't been enforcing it may not have been uniformly enforced.

BC: We are getting a lot of contractors who one has to pick it up on buildings that hadn't been started yet on other ones, on buildings that hadn't had a framing inspection yet and they may be specific issue related but I'm looking for some kind of generality.

TH: Is it not notated on the electrical engineer's document?

EH: That would be a good one for the code consistency meeting.

GM: That would almost be saying if it gets to permitting it's got a free ride to the end right or wrong; that's not going to be the case. It depends again on how serious of an issue it is; somewhat how easy it is to fix it. Sometimes it is an easy fix, it may be different but fixed. If costly, I'm sure the department would put our heads together to make a decision that is reasonable under the circumstances. We may also reach out to other jurisdictions to see what they have been doing on those particular issues. Sometimes it may just be bad news and you haven't had to do it in the past or maybe the department hasn't enforced it but it's wrong, we now know it is wrong. It's difficult for us to CO a project with something that we know is not compliant. There is no line in the sand policy on that. We would have to consider each case.

BC: You don't feel like we could say if it's not an imminent life safety issue than

PG: The mechanical issues were an example where something was retroactive?

BC: Mechanical issue is the other thing I will be asking about. This issue specifically is about when you have like a main panel of multiple main panels so you're bringing the electrical to the building in multiple locations and it needs to be tied by ground, all those locations need to be tied together.

GMullis: What it reflects primarily is the change that we've had within the industry in that particular instance and we did have the division where some were getting it and some weren't. This was never a change in the code it was an oversight by the industry (us being part of the industry).

BC: People that brought me the issue were not in any way suggesting that it wasn't there, that they shouldn't have been doing it in the first place, it's just that we struggle now with who has to retrofit and who doesn't, who has to put it in and who doesn't; is there a general rule we can go by?

GMullis: When it's a life safety issue this department could not do anything but say you must do this, there would have to be a change and appeal process through DOI for us to go that far and on that particular instance I don't think you'd have much chance at the state level.

Bernice Cutler: The second issue was about requiring dynamic ceiling radiation dampers. This issue came to me last Friday, what I'm down to with it saving you all the details is understanding that what's happening is that the dampers that are being installed where the a/c units blow out up in the duct work there are using dampers that are 555C listed, that listing is not tested for a damper that static pressure. What I'm looking for, because a dynamic ceiling radiation damper doesn't really exist and not small enough. We've got a couple of options, what I'd like to do (The Apartment Association brought this to me.) I think you all need to know who needs to be in the room but I'd like to have a couple of solutions that the Department is comfortable with that I can go back out to the Association and say here are the resolutions to this, now I've got enough information for them to explain where it's coming from I'd like to give them options that meet code, satisfy what the inspectors are going to be looking for and know that everybody is on the same page.

WH: I sent a letter out to the inspector, the plans examiners and also to a couple other folks (Wayne King and Dino Pappas). The original call I made was overturned by the DOI on April 10th which is unusual and then he allowed them complete the projects that were under construction with that call. But what he said was there were no dampers on the market to satisfy it.

BC: I talked to Dan and we came up with two resolutions but we want to make sure they are acceptable and the department is comfortable with them and that we can then put that out to the contractors and say here are the two options you've got or here is a selection of options you have that we know meet code and everyone is comfortable with but don't want to do that without your involvement.

WH: The information that I sent to him; he approved methods that I sent to him that we could use and they are in that memo. He does have other solutions but to me they are a lot more possible than that static radiation damper with a smoke detector.

PG: Bernice you said a meeting, who would attend? The Apartment Association in the meeting and Willis, who else do you want in the meeting?

BC: That's what I'm looking for; who else do you think we need? Do we need somebody from inspections mechanical, do we need, probably need to pull either Wayne or Dino and just make sure

everybody is on the same page with what the solution is so we can put it out to the contractors doing the work.

GM: Willis, when is the next Mechanical Consistency meeting?

WH: It is October 30th

GM: I think that would be the appropriate place to invite any interested parties into that meeting and discuss in that meeting?

PG: It would be a better agenda for everyone in the room plus you'll have inspectors and will have a broad range of feedback. Willis, who are you handing this off to since you will not be in the meeting?

WH: Bill Spidel

PG: We'll see if we can get that on the agenda and Bernice can invite whoever she wants. I will send you the dates and times of that meeting.

Ed Horne: I wanted to ask Gary Mullis regarding the electrical question awhile ago, do you think that is anything, is it pretty set or does it need to be brought up as an issue at the Electrical Consistency meeting?

GM: We could ask Joe to put it on his schedule.

EM: You mentioned that the Department was maybe inconsistently inspecting / doing it; if we find something like that shouldn't it be automatically something that we put out within the interpretation notification?

GM: Joe could have done it previous but not at every meeting. He may have covered that but I'll send him a note and have him add it to the consistency and put it on the web.

EM: I wouldn't even say it be on the agenda at least you could go ahead and put it right into the minutes in a document that people are accustomed to, that would be a good protocol on any item that we may have been inconsistent on that we ruled one way or the other.

PG: Gary we're going to put that back on the agenda right for the next quarter?

GMullis: I'll give it to Joe.

GM: Either that or we'll try to push it out with, do you know if he has pushed out the minutes to that meeting yet, the one we just had? If he hasn't maybe we can add that to those minutes as an item that was discussed in the BDC.

Jon Morris: We had a meeting last week with regard to racking permit issues that we're trying to attack from more of a systemic as opposed to a specific issue but I'll keep one comment as we still have not gotten our final inspection for that customer, Fire, Building, Electrical all keep pointing at each other for documentation missing. Special Inspections stuff has become problematic and I've probably gotten 25 emails since last Wednesday about it. It may be our fault, I just think that it points even more that we need to have next Brown Bag lunch in the next 2 – 3 weeks. I appreciate you Patrick getting the notice out so very quickly, so thank you. Scott Kerr was appreciative but it is a difficult process. I think we are going to be doing more racking especially if we ever start building new buildings again so it's not just a onetime thing, it's something that I think some time spent now would create some synergies and efficiencies later. Because it can't be an inefficient process for you guys either, the department is not making any money going out there 50 times.

Elliot Mann: I really don't have an item, I know Joe has a question that has been bouncing around the industry regarding fire separation.

John Taylor: Two comments, I wanted to say thanks to the building department especially plan review working on my Charlotte Knights project and it's been a very difficult task just to get in a position just to be able to submit documents not just based off the whole financing deal that everyone has seen in the news but the building department has gone above and beyond the call of duty just helping to review the plans, being available to answer any questions just on the permit process to make sure that we don't have an issue that would delay us in the schedule so I appreciate that. Chuck Walker as well. The other is a

question about Auto-notification on calling in for permits. The last time we had the discussion was being a single entity in a firm that gets the email notification and how that can be separated into really the project team.

GM: That's one of the subjects we are going to update you on. We've made a lot of progress. One thing is to expand the number of people that can receive those notifications without going through all the details if it's ok we'll cover that in a few minutes.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

Joe Padilla: I wanted to bring up the issue of firewall. Not so much the requirement itself but the need to actually put an option into every plan that would be there in every master plan in the event that was needed on that lot. What we try to do is to find a way to allow that option to be added when that particular plan is intended to be built within 3 (5) feet. You had an idea that you had thrown out last week with requiring it to be stamped for certain use and wanted to follow-up and see where you are at.

PG: The background; with the code change of 2012 for the residential they became 3' moved to 5' and now you've got a 10'. We had a lot of plan review which is the master plan stock, so we went through this evolution of moving things out. During that time there was a transition in this code that didn't go as well as we'd have liked. There was an industry shift and a plan review shift and we were moving stock out. One of the items we felt was important was this rated separation on these residential homes. The first thing we came up with as we were trying to get all the master plans up to current code which dealing with that rated separation issue (if you miss it in the field it's not an easy fix it's costly). We thought we were being proactive so I think Joe sent an email last week and we had a huddle in JB's office, Tim, PG, Gene, JG, GM what we were doing was bouncing things around what could we do to move this forward, keep construction going but also make them more aware of those issues. It's easy to do the plan review and permit a house then you get out there and ask is there a policy to deal with this. The point is not to have that problem in the field and be proactive and advise your customer. We came up with 2 options 1) to deal with the current stock we have is to get a letter from a PE or the contractor when they submit the permit they'll bring us a letter that their house will not be 5' or greater of the property line. It's measured from the property line to finished exterior. Overhand is a different requirement. This is becoming more critical to us in terms of the review process and the inspection process. It's important that everyone understand that if you get out there with this situation there's not too many value engineering tools at our disposal.

GM: What complicates this with the master plan, we don't put our hands on the review of a master plan. You make a reference, it gets a zoning review to verify it's over 3' and it sails right through. The problem now is we will probably have to add another step added into the process to collect that letter or acknowledge that we have that letter verifying 5' or more feet from the property line. That change will have to take place and will allow all the projects and all the master plans to be utilized without any additional fire rated walls or any modifications to the master plan. If we receive the letter and basically allow it to be permitted.

EM: If somebody chooses to have a detail in their master plan will you have to have a letter also? How are you going to know that a master plan already has that detail?

GM: The idea is to have a letter gets you a free ride through. Basically you are going to have to treat the houses closer than 5' as a custom review. You'll have to verify that the plan or the wall is correct, somehow it's going to hang up anything within 5'.

EM: Even if you already had a standard detail in your plan that calculates what your openings are and what your rating on the wall's going to be?

GM: Unless we can come up with a way to add another signifier, master plan number with a FR on the front/end indicating that it's been approved for closer... There are so many variations when getting closer than 5' whether you're closer than 3' or you're 3'-5', it gets complicated.

EM: You don't want to lose the benefit of Master plan either.

PG: No, we want to keep the integrity of master plan. It was built that way; it was more of a get it approved and come in and get it when you want it but I think that this particular issue is so complex. The residential code is getting more and more innovative and complex in these construction details. Some of the things we have seen in the field; the feedback that Jeff has helped with; Jeff do you mind sharing some of those conditions to let the group know that these are not easy fixes?

JG: We've had a situation with 2nd floor cantilevers out over closer than 5', we've had penetration, we've had percentage of openings that were too much, we've had plastic ice boxes in that rated wall, those penetration membrane or through penetrations like a dryer vent; you can't have those in the rated walls; hose bit PVC that comes through the rated wall, not properly sealed or protected. We've floor joists and trusses that sit on a wall that the floor's not ready. We've had some huge issues.

JP: What percentage of permits that you are seeing come through that are falling over the 5'?

EM: You don't know at permit.

GM: We usually don't know until the foundation or framing inspection.

EM: There are some municipalities where you have to submit a plot plan with your permit and becomes a signifier but at that point you still don't know whether the master plan has the right detail to match up with the conditions at that point.

TT: Some of the permit applications we get from customers show no side yard setbacks, they rely on zoning to put something in there and just because the zoning set back requirement is 3' doesn't necessarily mean that's where it's going to be situated on the lot.

EM: It could be 6' away and it's not an issue

TT: And we won't know until we roll up on the site.

EM: This has become a real big issue. The number of communities that have been designing this town with 5' and up in Cary and Raleigh with 3' side yards is incredible.

PG: To wrap up, Joe what our plan was to do the letter and keep it rolling; keep the product moving but we still have strong concerns on anything less than 5' it's going to go through custom review and just to make sure we can identify I think there is going to be a transition. Industry is going to have to understand this rated assembly and what we need to look for. We need to make sure that we're doing something good and not going out there trying to fix everything that we build. The first part, we need to go small with these steps, get everyone in tune as to what a rated assembly is, what's allowed in the rated assembly and the construction methods actually putting it together, it can get complicated and we don't want to tear stuff out if we can help it.

JP: It's more than just adding a fire rated assembly, it's potentially changing that entire detail. What I'll do with the Builders meeting on Thursday, I'll bring that up to them and say that's the approach.

PG: That's short term. I think long term is we need to come up with another way to identify it and there's going to be either an identification mark like Gene said. I think each master builder should have a fire separation file that deals with that particular house in the fire separation file for all their conditions so we can have their conditions and it'll have it. Still you have to install it. It's nice to throw it out to Jeff and Gary but you've got to understand how to put it together.

EM: And even if they went to that, our master plan set up isn't set up to be able to know that that's there to start off with so how is it going to work anyway?

PG: There's a whole transition for it and is a long term goal for us.

TT: We either identify that particular model as less than 5' from the property line and then you don't have a detail or we require the detail otherwise in that way it's covered in any site location.

EM: You said there is a meeting Thursday?

JP: The builders are meeting Thursday at 1:00, it's an HBA meeting.

EM: Would it make sense to add one of these guys?

JP: It might be worthwhile to at least bring up the issue, I don't want to mess up your day but at the very least I'll go over what the short term approach is and then will work on the long term fix. We just wanted to make sure right now we've heard from a lot of builders saying "I'm having to basically add an optional

fire wall to every master plan I've got and I know I'm more than 5' off and am having to redesign that option anyway, that's the need we're trying to avoid.

PG: I see that problem. If you're never going to be that close why do it? It's a lot of effort and we know that.

EM: There may just need to be a certification that the builders signs off on and takes responsibility and they end up getting a house that's constructed and at that stage there're going to get a framing inspection they are going to have to go backwards on, it's their issue at that point.

JP: That was kind of my thought; that you would basically certify the builder had a plan without a fire wall rated option they would then certify that this plan could not be built within 5' feet of the sideline and if it ever needed to change they would need to come in and have that option approved before they could go ahead and submit the permits on.

EM: Along that same line has anybody come up with a good approved method for venting when you are in that 5' and less zone?

JG: Some of the details we've seen is the core vent we've seen that pop up in detail, it's actually put on top of the roof decking and flush with your fascia board. Projection requirement is 1 hour protection on the underside.

EM: That's where some people are getting misinterpretation.

TH: What inspection are inspectors required to see the property line? Is it the foundation?

JG: Typically if it is in close proximity to other houses and we're not able to determine where that property line is we are asking for the survey.

GM: And that would apply to residential remodels, additions as well. We've had some cases where we have a 2nd story added to an existing 1 story and it can't be added where it's that with wall and window openings.

4. NC DOI SPECIAL EVENTS-TEMPORARY STRUCTURES APPEAL

Patrick discussed the NCDOI Special Events and Temporary Structures Appeal. Handouts include 2 charts and text that describes the two charts. The first Chart A-Special Events Key Agency Attributes. This process started back in April when the DNC came to town we were looking at different ways on how to permit special events and also had a joint venture with the city which was an excellent partnership. We also had projects internally we were doing but didn't really have them mapped out. There was a conversation with the NCDOI and they were very curious about what we were doing, what we were looking at what we were enforcing. That drove the meeting with the NCDOI here in Charlotte and the Fire Department on September 25th. We created the handouts to give them an idea of what our permit / inspection process is in dealing with special events and temporary structures. The really wanted to know how our partnerships work with other agencies and unrelated agencies (direct/indirect relationships), kind of a dynamic process. We created the Key Attributes; they work from the top and most were key things that agencies in the providence wanted to know so that they can determine what track/review process would be involved.

The second Chart B – Special Events Work Flow Processing is the actual lead processes, CFD, City Agencies and Mecklenburg County so we all have an identity in special events and temporary structures. This chart (b) walks you through the process in how decisions are made and what tracks they identify whether it's inside the right of way, outside the right of way, less than 7 days, more than 7 days but less than 179 days. We created these charts gave the presentation to DOI, City Fire was there and helped us tremendously. There was a lot of team effort, I'll tell you everyone in this room helped contribute to the charts, the feedback and the tools, the text, the CAs the Directors. At the conclusion of the meeting it was determined that Mecklenburg County would withdraw their appeal that they sent to the State of North Carolina, June 19th, 2012. We understand that the appeal has been formally dismissed not to be brought back and we are not going to pursue that anymore as it's a closed issue. We think having talked with DOI they feel comfortable with our process and our partnerships for their agencies and what we look at and

what we review, the 7 day marker and also some electrical issues were brought up, of course the partnerships with the City Engineering Department, CPD and CFD. Questions?

5. QUARTERLY REPORTS

TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD QUARTERLY REPORT

Lon McSwain reviewed the Technical Advisory Board's quarterly report stating we held 3 meeting last quarter on July 18, August 15 and September 19. A synopsis is included on page two of the report and in brief. Reinstating GPR was discussed in detail, and the TAB is not inclined to support that. The TAB also briefly reviewed other programs used around the country to encourage sustainable design. A suggestion was made to add an energy component to the NC Rehab Code, perhaps similar to the 20% rule used in accessibility code requirements on existing buildings. The TAB agreed to create two subcommittees to work on the following topics;

- a) Details for a new/revised program approach to incentives for sustainable design
- b) The standards (IgCC with G-34, et al) to be used in 'a' and how to verify compliance.

TAB also agreed that regular TAB meetings would be suspended until the SubComm's complete their work. Department reps met with 14 members of the Chamber Land Use Committee on 9/26, seeking input on ideas to incentivize sustainable design. Significant ideas identified in the meeting included; Permit fee rebates or even property tax credits don't get to the heart of the issue; Verifying the work complies is a big challenge. The LEED certification cost is a problem. Could the Department create a capacity to certify projects to qualify for various parts of the incentive options arrayed (see below), replacing the LEED (or other) certification program cost? Connect LEED/IgCC categories with entities who benefit; negotiate an incremental credits to the owner (example - CMUD bill discount if your design category unburdens their system) Creates an array of category options the owner could pick from to construct their own benefit package. The Green Build Team continues to work on two BIM/IPD pilot projects with Carolina Healthcare.

CONSISTENCY TEAM REPORT

Willis Horton reviewed the Consistency Team Report, see below outline.

- Front end:
 - i. Meckpermit.com consistency cover page memo contains announcement about consistency meeting schedules
 - ii. August and September meetings were canceled because of the DNC
 - iii. Customer notice e-mail on CTAC-EPS
 - iv. Customer notice e-mail on the change to RDS-Master Plan
- Report content:
 - Building: 1 meeting, Covered 7 Residential Code topics and 4 Commercial Building Code Topics
 - Electrical: 1 meeting, Covered the new provisions of the 2011 National Electrical Code which was just adopted by the State
 - Mechanical/Fuel Gas: 1 meeting, covered 13 topics
 - Plumbing: 1 meeting, Covered 7 topics

CODE COMPLIANCE REPORT

Willis Horton reviewed the Code Compliance Report, see below outline.

- Note comparative format; you can compare how topics and their standings change, quarter to quarter.
 - So you can compare how the most frequent defects changes between quarters;
- "Not ready"; Bldg – 10.88% (was 8.44%), Elec – 7.23% (was 7.34%), Mech – 6.66% (was 4.99%), plbg – 10.88% (was 11.75%)
 - Note building is up about 2.5% and Mech is up about 1.5%.

- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
 - Bldg; rough @ 41.35% (up 8% from 33.5%), finish @ 25.38% (up 2.5% from 22.78%),)
 - Elec; rough @ 18.38% (down 4% from 22.14%), finish @ 59.94% (up 2.7% from 57.2%)
 - Mech; rough @ 22.91% (dn 1% from 23.76%), finish @ 64.26% (dn 1.7% from 65.96%)
 - Plbg; rough @ 29.48% (up 2.7% from 26.76%), finish @ 43.16% (dn 1.3% from 44.5%)

EM: Under building code defects; soil compaction test, do we need to get some communication out that the new tool we have to be able to post documents for purposes of CO or getting meters early that it is a excellent mechanism to get those documents in.

JG: We were going to do that with the automated process for temporary utilities but we could go ahead and do that earlier for that one piece.

Gene Morton: I want to get your opinion on the Quarterly Reports. You'll notice they get very sizable and wanted to know if you feel like we need to continue providing you these printed copies? They are posted electronically on the website. We can always continue to review similar to what Willis just reviewed and give you a snapshot of what's up/down/same, etc. What are your thoughts on continuing to receive paper copies.

TH: Can it be emailed to the board every quarter?

GM: Would an email with the link where it's located work?

JM: I think these summary tables because you do see where the industry is not up to snuff and could be better but this whole thing is a lot.

PG: We will email the link to the members showing the next quarterly reports.

COMMERCIAL PLAN REVIEW REPORT

Melanie Sellers reviewed the Commercial Plan Review Report, see below outline.

Part I: 70% of projects pass on 1st rev'w; 80% have passed after 2nd rev'w

- pass rates on 1st review by trade:
 - Bldg—84% (was 87%); Elec – 86% (same); Mech – 84% (was 87%); Plbg – 81% (was 86%);

Part II: most common defects: examples

- Bldg: Appendix B, exit signs, exit rq'ts, fire ratings, construction type
- Elec: General, Services/ Feeders, branch circuits, grounding & bonding, motors & ref'g eqpt
- Mech: Fresh air req't, eqpt location, exhaust systems, duct systems, emergency compliance
- Plbg: general installation, venting, drainage piping, water distr piping, wtr heater inst

Part III: 1st rev'w use of approved as noted at 34% by all trades on the average (same as last quarter)

- biggest users; CFD (83%) and MCFM (80)
- critical path users;
 - Bldg (30%, up from 25%)__, Elec (12%, up from 9%)__,
 - Mech (16%, down from 22%)__, Plbg (19%, down from 26%)__
- So Bldg and Elec up (3-5%), and MP down (6-7%)

6. QUARTERLY BDC BULLETIN EXERCISE

Previous bulletin topics:

October, 2010	January, 2011	April, 2011	July, 2011
Why Meck County is a project asset	TAB purpose and customer participation	BIM-IPD code change public hearing	Update on Senate Bill 22
Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice	Technology development and budget baseline	CRWG startup	2012 NC Bldg Code transition dates from BCC
AE Pass Rate success	Status of EV introduction	Website redesign EPM development status	TU/LCU/CC/TCO/CO changes in process & fees

Progress on reorg plan Field service improvements	Elec J-man program pilot Meckpermit.com changes	Permit activity & IRT Impact of Senate Bill 22	NACO awards AE Pass Rate status FY11 Key data points
October, 2011	January, 2012	April, 2012	July, 2012
Carbon Monoxide alarm requirements Cost Recovery Work Group status 2012 NC Building Code transition Changes in temporary utility process	2012 NC State Building Code transition CRWG final report EPS-EPR startup Permit revenue trends Website redesign	NC Res'd Code transition 2012 NC Building Code commercial project transition rules Code Enforcement FY13 budget proposal	Fy2012 year end work load summary Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC RDS program challenges Prelim Review policy change Dept available for early project meetings on process.

October, 2012
DNC Successes
CRWG Detail Work -Upfit Calculator -Owner as Contractor
RDS Master plan Options
CSS Customer Focus Group

EM: Suggested that because we use so many acronyms on everything from A-Z; at least in the titles can we put what the description of the acronym is in bold and then use the acronym below. I guarantee that a lot of people that don't see stuff that's relevant to them because they don't know what the acronyms are.

GM: We need to use the standard process; the first time you use an acronym use the words then put the acronym in parentheses.

EM: Especially for something that is as wide spread distribution as this. I think it would be beneficial to the readers.

7. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Statistics report

Permit Revenue

- September permit (only) revenue- \$1,200,325, compares to August revenue of \$1,477,828.
 - Fy13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $\$13,752,568/12 = \$1,143,798$
 - So September permit revenue is \$56,527 above monthly projection
- At 9/30/12, YTD permit rev of \$4,100,874 is above permit fee rev projection by \$669,480, or 19.5%

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- September total - \$156,133,020, compared to August total of \$267,865,965
- YTD at 9/30/12 of \$629.53M; this is 12.2% below constr value permit'd YTD at 9/30/11, of \$716.9M

Permits Issued:

	August	Sept	3 Month Trend
Residential	3659	2994	4340/4170/3659/2994

Commercial	3134	2181	2565/2314/3134/2181
Other (Fire/Zone)	480	469	471/455/480/469
Total	7273	5644	7376/6939/7273/5644

- Residential down 18.2%; commercial down 30.4%; total down 22.4%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	August	Sept	Insp. Perf.	August	Sept	% Change
Bldg.	5246	4509	Bldg.	5192	4444	-14.4%
Elec.	7534	5751	Elec.	7547	5757	-23.7%
Mech.	3865	3121	Mech.	3904	3069	-21.4%
Plbg.	2735	2408	Plbg.	2721	2373	..-12.8%
Total	19,380	15,789	Total	19,364	15,643	-19.2%

- Insp performed all down 12% to 23%; Insp performed were 99.1% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept	Aug	Sept
Bldg.	94.5	93.4	96.0	94.7	98.9	97.4	1.12	1.16
Elec.	94.6	96.1	95.7	96.5	99.3	98.5	1.11	1.09
Mech.	97.5	95.7	98.2	96.2	99.6	98.8	1.05	1.10
Plbg.	99.8	96.7	99.9	96.8	100	99.4	1.00	1.07
Total	95.9	95.4	96.9	96.0	99.4	98.4	1.08	1.11

- Elec up 1.5%; Bldg down 1%, Mech down 2%, Plbg down 3%
- Overall average position well above 85-90% goal range

Inspection Pass Rates for September, 2012:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.16%, compared to 85.02%, in August

Bldg: August – 79.17% **Elec:** August – 83.81%
September – 76.13% September – 83.82%

Mech: August – 86.75% **Plbg:** August – 93.3%
September – 86.73% September – 92.92%

- Elec and Mech same; Plbg down slightly; Bldg down 3%
- Overall average down < 1%, but still well above 75-80% goal range

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for September, 2012

CTAC:

- 151 first reviews; up from 136 in August.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 64%
- CTAC was 61% of OnSch (*) first review volume $(151/151+96 = 257) = 58.8\%$
*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11: 176- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11: 184 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11: 143 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012: 136 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12: 139 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12: 127 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12: 151 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
 - Note: drop in all trades rate is owed to County Zoning % being down.

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on October 1, 2012, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-4 work days booking lead, but MCFM - 7, and Health at 8 days.
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-3 work days lead, but Bldg -16, MP - 13, MCFM - 7 & Health at 8 days.
 - 5-8 hr projects; at 3 work days lead, but Bldg -16, M/P - 15, MCFM - 7 & Health at 13 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 4 work days and all others at 2-3 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 6 work days for small projects, 8 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

September Meeting Follow Up

RDS Master Plan Review Options

- As previously discussed with the BDC, and noted to customers in the June 1 customer letter on RDS status, we outlined a future RDS Master Plan service option as follows.
 - a) *Future alternate: in the past the Department began master plan reviews only when an actual permit is submitted. In the future, we will announce a home builder option in which we will perform the master plan review in advance of a permit application, provided the cost of the plan review is secured per a method specified by the Department. This advance payment for plan review would be credited back to the home builder on the first permits issued under that master plan number. While this does not contribute an immediate solution to our current RDS challenges, long term it will help prevent future problems*
- On September 28, the Department broadcast an e-mail announcing this change, effective October 1st.

Updates on Other Department Work

CSS Report Follow up Work

Gene Morton discussed the Customer Satisfaction Survey focus group; we are planning to put together two focus groups, 1 with primarily contractors and designers the other is more general in nature to address some of our things like returning phone calls some of the other things we were struggling with on our survey. We've identified 3 architectural engineering representatives, 3 contractors, Jim is still looking to identify one more contractor and one more architect/engineer and would like any suggestions from the BDC members, primarily the building trade groups.

TH: I'll send him some names; do you want them from trades?

GM: General Contractors is what we're looking for. Send to Jim and copy Gene and Rebecca.

When we finally get the group together, we have the meeting scheduled for this Friday so it may be late notice for somebody new that hasn't heard about it but the sooner the better. When assembled this group will address 5 areas: 1) customer expectations for timely inspections compared to the IRT/Department goal; 2) understanding the plan review and permitting umbrella, what we do vs. what other city or county agencies do, separating the two understanding where we are responsible where we are not; 3) reach the right person is a question that we still struggle with and we need suggestions that go beyond the list of steps that we've taken today; 4) help clarify what clear explanation of changes mean whether it's about the process the department uses for processing your permitting services or whether it's about the code requirements and we're not clear where the struggle seems to be that's reflecting in the survey; 5) suggestions on how to elevate customer awareness on the value of the project managers and the code enforcement managers that we have here; we want to make sure we get the word out as well as we can that they are here to help you. The meeting strategy per July 17th BDC meeting notes; management met on October 9th to prep examples/handouts to drive the discussion in the Group A meeting. The Group B meeting as I mentioned; we're still struggling to get that group together. Jim has met with the Chamber's Natalie English and sent a letter requesting referrals, we still need to meet to discuss but they've been very busy with post-DNC clean up. Met with Ken Lamba, Dean of UNCC College of Architecture and Art, they are still discussing what they might be able to do to help us. Any other BDC ideas on contacts would help; send those to Jim. Any contacts you have in mind send those names to Jim, where they are from and how they may be able to help us. We will set up a meeting as soon as we can identify the players to make that worthwhile.

Auto-Notification Reconvene of CCTF

Gene shared that we've made significant changes that were recommended by the customers including the following:

- a) Contractor verification that account is setup properly; there will be a process where he can go and run a check, he can do a test to verify that he can get the message once it's set up.
- b) Contractor option/ability to tailor notification contacts by permit (still confirming what's possible) so that multiple contacts can be made through the auto notification process, it can be the office, separate superintendents that are responsible for specific permits/projects.
- c) Purpose of program changes from notice that "I'm headed your way" (15 minute goal) to "You are the next up after my current inspection" (goal of 1 hour +/-). Typically could be anywhere from 0 minutes to 15 minutes, it's very short notice, we're hoping the change will be to click the button just prior to doing an inspection and as soon as we're finished with that inspection we're headed to your job. You'll get more notice that may equate to something like 30 minutes to 1 hour of notice.
- d) Designation of H1-H2 status, regarding homeowner waiting. Clarification for the designation of multi-trade inspections, we code those with a H1 or H2 designation, we may have a homeowner that is waiting at home or that needs notice to take off to meet someone at home or there's an access issue if they aren't notified.
- e) Inspector sees notice reminder button, and can tell if he/she sent notice, including confirmation notice that computer sent message. In the past when the inspector clicked on the auto notification button it didn't change but with the new programming when they click it they can tell that they've clicked it.
- f) Programming change is 98% complete, with staff demo on Oct 9 (no customers able to make the meeting). We did a staff demo on October 9th we invited several contractors that were participants earlier in our design process, unfortunately none of them were able to attend the

demonstration. We will provide a demonstration at the next BDC meeting, by that time it will be complete and ready to roll out as we want to give you the opportunity to see the changes. We are looking for opportunities to present to REBIC/HBA/NARI members, etc. Once we get the final changes made we'll be contacting some of the groups asking if we can come out and demonstrate. Also, we'll devote time in the next consistency meetings to demonstrate the new features. If software availability supports, will also work on a Department YouTube style video on both auto notification and our temporary utility program so we can push that out through our web site.

Update on Builder Concerns on Temporary Electrical Process

GM: The only changes we are waiting on is the programming end to make it fully automatic.

JG: Our most recent information is by January 1st the process will be a fully automatic online process; in the meantime we are using the temporary bridge "the upload document".

EM: How are we going to get this out and really make sure people know this is available?

GM: We'll use Notify Me email blasts.

JG: We'll probably follow up the same way we have with auto notification where we will try to present before NARI and the home builders association and any organization we can.

- Continue advancing the various stages of development and change introduction explained to the BDC in the September meeting, including;
 - a) Current process will continue to work for those that don't get the word.
 - b) short term option will be an enhancement to current process (basically same form just able to upload on the system without coming into the office).
 - c) When fully automated, everyone will need to make the transition because of the questionnaire process involved and also the form option will no longer be acceptable
 - d) Plan to do an e-mail blast to customers, at that stage and as website instructions are updated.
- Current status as of today:
 - a) temporary measures are in place and being used, new instruction sheet is on the web
 - b) Programming status; IST is still determining time required & we should have that by Oct 16. Thereafter we will confirm the final schedule to execute the change.

Roofing Contractor Awareness of Permit Requirements and Related Mechanical Work

GM: The roofing contractor awareness issue that we've discussed for 2-3 meetings, we're still working on getting that word sent out through some of the billings.

WH: I emailed Cam Coley with CMUD on Tuesday, October 2nd and he is still working on it. I had hoped to get this out in November but they said we were going to miss the November billing. I am hoping for December in getting that out either in mailers and also the web site. Also, Loree Elslick with Piedmont Natural Gas who I finally reached after a couple of weeks, referred me to Jennifer Sharp. I talked to Jennifer today at 2:00 on the phone after her being on vacation... I'm sending her this information that you see above and so she can get it out not only on their web site but also on their mailers, this is coming to fruition as quickly as I can make it happen.

- The Department/Willis have agreed with BDC reps on the outline for a customer memo, including;
 - a) *Roofers are required to obtain a Building Permit from Mecklenburg County Code Enforcement for work that exceeds \$ 5,000.00.*
 - b) *Regardless, if the work is less than \$5000.00 or more than \$5000.00 if the residence has gas appliances (water heaters or furnaces) a mechanical permit is required to inspect the gas vent piping for a separated vent connection.(provide links to examples)*
 - c) *A separated vent connection is extremely dangerous and could cause sickness or death to the inhabitants of the home if it is not repaired.*
 - d) *A mechanical or plumbing contractor licensed in the State of North Carolina is required to pull the permit, check and/or repair damaged vent piping, and get the home inspected for final approval by Mecklenburg County Inspectors.*
 - e) *Homeowners please make sure your roofer is aware of this new requirement. See Meckpermit.com web site for further information.*

RDS Plan Review Status at 10.8.2012

- Turnaround times as of 10/8/2012; paper plans at 4 days, E-plans at 4 day, townhomes at 8 days.
- We believe this issue is behind us and no longer requires special monitoring, beyond our normal regimen.

Manager/CA Added Comments

No Manager/CA added comments.

8. Adjournment

The October 16th, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned 4:34 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 20th, 2012.